Approved For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RDP78-05343A000100050003-9

29 July 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Drug Policy

1. Mr. Brownman chaired a meeting on 25 July on the subject of the standards being used to evaluate applicants and employees as related to drug usage. Attending the meeting were Mr. Blake; Mr. Janney and from the Office of Personnel; Messrs. Kane,

25X1A 25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

myself. (Early in the meeting, however, Mr. Kane was called away and chaired the Security portion of the meeting.)
Before the meeting actually began, Mr. Janney was most complimentary of the OMS paper, "Medical Aspects of Drug Abuse," dated 5 July 1974. It was his feeling that this paper should be made widely available and that it should be required reading for young people, especially those going overseas. I indicated that I would pass on his favorable comments to those who had contributed to the writing of the paper.

While it wasn't immediately clear what the meeting hoped to accomplish, it did become evident that Mr. Brownman was questioning the current standards of evaluation and wondering if the Agency was not behind the times and rigid in its The brunt of the defense fell to the Office of Security who apparently had anticipated these basic questions. Accordingly, the Office of Security made a presentation as to how it handles problems of drug abuse and in so doing went into detail as to their procedures and underlying attitudes and philosophies. (At this point Mr. Brownman left the meeting to attend another meeting.) Following their presentation, which also included a question/answer section, Mr. Janney was invited to comment. He expressed some concern about his putting in process a case with a history of drug abuse that would later be turned down by the Office of Security based solely on that same history. Mr. Blake pointed out that the recent policy statement of 14 June 1974 provided opportunity for the Director of Personnel to refer cases to the Applicant Review Panel (ARP) before putting them in process and that the Director of Personnel in utilizing the panel could well resolve the question that he posed. I was invited to comment and offered the observation

SUPPERT TO CHIEDAM MEMBERS DEVENDED COMMONLE OF E. O. 1987E, ESTEWAY CHIEVE DOWNSRADED AT TWO YELLS OF MARKET DE

(Insert data or event)

CL BY: Aβργονed For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RIPP78-03343200097005000099

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/08/09 : CIA-RDP78-05343A000100050003-9

SUBJECT: Drug Policy

that the evaluation of drug usage at times is difficult, that there is reason for differences in viewpoint, that our Agency system and attitudes are conscientious and as expert as we can get. I stated that I did not know where to go to get better advice.

Mr. Blake then said he would like to break the problem down in two parts, one general, one specific. regard the general question, he wondered if anyone had any problem with the existing procedures and, in particular, the standards and attitudes of the Office of Security. This question was unanimously answered in the negative. turned to the specifics and suggested that we discuss a particular case. It appeared there was an applicant who had used LSD on thirteen occasions. The Office of Security when questioned indicated they would turn down such a case. I was asked what OMS would do in such a hypothetical case. I advised that we would want to see such an individual and if this were the only item of consideration and the individual qualified in every other respect, we would want to bring such a case to the attention of the panel. Mr. Janney's reply was that if this were the only problem regarding the individual and if he had discontinued the use of LSD sometime ago, he would be inclined to approve the applicant. It then turned out that this hypothetical case was really the case of | It appears that the Office of Security is recommending a disqualification. The OMS has approved the case. It was Mr. Blake's view, and he asked to comply, that a paper should be prepared by the Office of Security which would incorporate their views and that he would use this paper as a basis for discussion of this case with the Director. He also stated that he felt that differences among the offices might well arise in the future, but he also felt that such differences could be handled among themselves, and that he would not expect to have to adjudicate cases in the future too often. Further, he felt that the whole question of drug standards should stop with this meeting and not be referred to other groups or participants to adjudicate.

25X1A

25X1A

JOHN R. TIETJEN, M. D.
Director of Medical Services

25X1A

25X1A

	UNCLASSIFIED	XX CONFIDER	TOP AND B	SECRET	
	OFFI	CIAL ROUTING	S SLIP		
то	NAME AN	D ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS	
1	DD/MS		1AUG 11974	V	
2	C/PS	I Aug	5,1974	Pm	
3	DC/PS *	-1255	12	R	
4	C/SPD		9/4/24	Mar	
5			105 EPT74	03	
6			9/5	Jar	
	ACTION	DIRECT REPLY		E REPLY	
	COMMENT	DISPATCH	RETURN	MENDATION	
	CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNAT		
	narks: 7. O-D/MS				
	7. O-D/MS	HERE TO RETURN TO		DATE	
	7. O-D/MS	, ADDRESS AND PHONE I		DATE 29Ju174	